

GERALD NUNN; JUDITH L NUNN,
Plaintiffs,
v.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA; JPMORGAN
CHASE BANK, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION,
Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-03862-WHO

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:
DISMISSAL FOR FAILURE TO
PROSECUTE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 31, 35

STATE OF CALIFORNIA; JPMORGAN
CHASE BANK, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION,
Defendants.

Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. filed a motion to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint. Dkt. No. 31. That matter is set to be heard on November 7, 2018. Plaintiffs' opposition or response to that motion **was due on September 10, 2018**.

Defendant State of California also filed a motion to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint. Dkt. No. 35. That matter is also set to be heard on November 7, 2018. Plaintiffs' opposition or response to that motion **was due on September 14, 2018**. As of the date of this Order, plaintiffs have not filed an opposition or otherwise responded to either defendants' motions to dismiss.

Plaintiffs are **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute **by filing an opposition or other response to the motions to dismiss by October 17, 2018**. If plaintiffs do not file such responses by that date, this case may be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 41(b); Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986) (listing factors relevant to whether to dismiss for lack of prosecution).

11

11

11


66

1 If plaintiffs file their opposition by October 17, 2018, both Defendant JPMorgan Chase
2 Bank, N.A and Defendant State of California may file a reply by October 24, 2018. The hearing
3 on the motion to dismiss remains set for **November 7, 2018** at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2, 17th
4 Floor, San Francisco, California.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: October 4, 2018

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



William H. Orrick
United States District Judge